UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,084	10/518,084 08/24/2005 Hakan l		1510-1097	2895
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 01/12/200 OMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison St Suite 500	reet	KOSLOW, CAROL M		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/518,084	ENGQVIST ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	C. Melissa Koslow	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	uran unee monurs alter the mailing dat	e or the linarrejection, e	veri ii timety illeu,
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		21	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12)		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplicant / time numerit (102 024).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 39-60. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/C. Melissa Koslow/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1793	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendment to claim 55 of "said hydration liquid is a bonding system" is new matter and raises an indefiniteness issue.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendments were not entered and the arguments were not convincing. The arguments address the amendments are moot since the amendment was not entered. It is noted that the calcium aluminate in U.S.patent 6,143,069 has a larger molar content of calcium than aluminum. In addition the reference does not consider fly ash as being part of the taught calcium aluminate cement system. The arguments with respect to the objection to the specification are not convincing since the argued section teaches phases that form phosphate ions, not water soluble phosphates. The phrase that the Examiner is objecting to is found on page 8, lines 10-11. The arguments with respect to the objection to the specification are not convincing since the claims are not part of the specification and it is not the claims that are being the objected to, but the specification. Applicants have not pointed out where in pages 1-10 of the specification where the claimed subject matter is found. The arguments with respect to claim 45 are not convincing since the argued section is not to the powder of the cement system before any hydration occurs. The argument with respect to claim 47 does not overcome the rejection since claims 46 teaches two different phosphates and the specification teaches that other phosphate can be present. Thus it is unclear to which of the taught and claimed phosphate claim 47 is referring.